

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the instant application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants traverse the outstanding rejections of claims 1-26 and submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112, first paragraph*

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In particular, with respect to the feature recited in claim 1, "wherein said branding tool maps said branded information provided in said supplier subscription records to profile information provided in said customer profile records and transfers resulting targeted branded information to said customer system", the Examiner states that the specification does not describe in a clear and concise manner the process by which the branding tool maps supplier subscription records to customer profile records such that a skilled artisan can make and use the invention. The Examiner goes on to state that the specification does not describe in a clear and concise manner the process by which the branding tool transfers information to a customer such that a skilled artisan can make and use the invention. Claim 10 includes language similar to the

above and has been rejected on the same basis.

In addition, with respect to the feature recited in claim 1, "applications software, including a branding tool operable for creating and disseminating branded information", the Examiner states that the specification does not describe in a clear and concise manner the process by which the branding tool creates and disseminates information such that a skilled artisan can make and use the invention.

The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the specification is sufficiently enabled with respect to the aforementioned features. Support for the features may be found throughout the specification and, in particular, paragraphs [0014-0017]. For example, paragraph [0014] discloses that the "supplier branding application allows suppliers to create branded information and sales collateral that can be shared with their customers on a customized basis." Paragraph [0015] describes processes by which the branding tool transfers information to a customer, stating the "branded information and sales collateral provided is meta-tagged and stored in order to target a particular customer at a specific point in time. The metatagging process allows for the information retrieval by specified individuals, and also prevents dissemination of the information to certain individuals such as a competitor of the supplier of the information." The storage of this information is described further in paragraph [0017] and further provides details about the supplier subscription records and customer profile records. In paragraph [0016], the process continues, stating [s]erver 104 may be configured to periodically collect the branded information from the web servers of subscribing supplier entities 110, and populate the appropriate member customer portal(s) by pushing the information via the supplier-provided meta-tags mapped to corresponding customer profile records."

For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicants submit that claims 1 and 10 are sufficiently enabled pursuant to 35 USC 112, first paragraph, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. Claims 2-9 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1 and claims 11-14 depend from what should be an allowable claim 10. For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claims 2-9 and 11-14 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

With respect to the feature recited in claim 15, "if a match is found, transmitting associated branded information to a customer system associated with said customer profile records", the Examiner states that the specification does not describe in a clear and concise manner the process by which a match is found such that a skilled artisan can make and use the invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the specification is sufficiently enabled with respect to the aforementioned features. For example, paragraph [0016] discloses that "[s]erver 104 may be configured to periodically collect the branded information from the web servers of subscribing supplier entities 110, and populate the appropriate member customer portal(s) by pushing the information via the supplier-provided meta-tags mapped to corresponding customer profile records." Thus, information is mapped using meta-tags, which are used to match up the information in customer profile records to target records. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claim 15 is sufficiently enabled pursuant to 35 USC 112, first paragraph, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection. Claims 16-20 depend from what should be an allowable claim 15, and for at least this reason, it is believed that claims 16-20 are also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 16-20 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the feature recited in claim 21, "associating metatags with response data provided in said target record", the Examiner states that the specification does not describe in a clear and concise manner the process by which metatags are associated with response data such that a skilled artisan can make and use the invention. The Examiner states that the word "metatag" is not included in the specification. The Applicants respectfully disagree and direct the Examiner's attention to paragraphs [0015-0016] in support. The Applicants further submit that claim 21 is sufficiently enabled pursuant to 35 USC 112, first paragraph at least for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 15. Claims 22-26 depend from what should be an allowable claim 21 and for at least this reason, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22-26 are in condition for allowance.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites "a branding tool operable for creating and disseminating branded information." The Examiner states that the scope of the invention is difficult to determine because it is unclear what comprises "branded information." In the instant action, the Examiner has applied a common dictionary definition i.e., an identifying mark or label on the products of a particular company; trademark. The Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to paragraph [0014] which expounds upon the term 'branded information', stating that branded information may include "corporate brochures, product specifications and usage information, industrial data, technical manuals, user manuals, or any other suitable information. The

information may be text based or may include graphics, sound, streaming video, etc.” The Applicants submit that claim 1 is sufficiently definite and complies with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 2-14 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 2-14 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, in the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorney

By Marisa J. Dubuc  
Marisa J. Dubuc  
Reg. No. 46,673  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Phone: (860) 286-2929  
Fax: (860) 286-0115  
Customer Service No. 22851

Date: December 21, 2005